

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: June 11, 2001
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
June 6, 2001 (Meeting #18)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member (A)
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

(P) Primary (A) Alternate

Public:

Foster Church	The Oregonian
Lou Dooley	SW Washington Health District
Patty Grau	Hazel Dell Sewer District
Ken Hadley	Self
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Association of Realtors
Matt Lewis	CCHBA
Chuck McDonald	Hazel Dell Sewer District
Alison Mielke	Friends of Clark County
Michael Vinatieri	SW Washington Health District

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Alan Boguslawski	Clark County Development Services
Brian Carlson	Clark County Public Works
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning

Tamara DeRidder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Gordon Euler	Clark County Long Range Planning
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Phil Wuest	Clark County Long Range Planning

1. Roll call / Introductions

Commissioner Morris called the meeting to order at 4:17 PM at Underwriters Laboratories in Camas. Steering Committee members and staff at the front tables introduced themselves.

2. Review May 2, 2001 Steering Committee Notes

Commissioner Morris called for comments on the May 2 summary notes. No corrections or changes to the summary notes were made.

3. Update on Board of Commissioners decisions on the plan update

Commissioner Morris summarized the recent changes made by the Board of County Commissioners as follows:

- **Single Family/Multi-family Housing Density**

A tiered approach is adopted designating a residential density goal of six dwelling units per acre within the urban growth areas of Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield, and Washougal; 4 units per acre within LaCenter; and eight units per acre within the Vancouver urban growth area. No density goal is designated for the Yacolt urban growth area due to lack of sanitary sewer.

- **Single Family/Multi-family Housing Split**

No single housing type is to exceed 75% of new housing stock in any urban growth area.

- **Estimate of additional land in UGA's based on above decisions**

Oliver Orjiako summarized the worksheet handout prepared by County Long Range Planning staff. The handout allocates residential, commercial, and industrial

development to each city's urban growth area, based on the most recent BOCC policy decisions, and based on current assumptions.

On the first sheet, the residential factors include an assumption that 10% of vacant residential lands and 30% of underutilized residential lands will never convert to full development. The "redevelopment factor" is also a "never to convert factor". Of the lands that are developed, no additional residential, industrial, or commercial capacity is assumed to occur through redevelopment. Thus, 100% are never to convert.

Under the Commercial and Industrial headings on the first worksheet, it is possible the "employees per net acre" assumptions could change based on further review of the Buildable Lands Program.

At the May 2, 2001 Steering Committee meeting, staff were asked to provide a capacity analysis of the existing urban growth areas. These projections are itemized in the second, third, and fourth worksheets, based on the vacant buildable lands model run for the year 2000. Based on all the current assumptions for residential lands, 92,091 persons could be accommodated within the existing urban growth areas. The analysis of commercial lands indicates a capacity for 14,190 new jobs, and 5,133 new jobs for prime and secondary industrial lands. However, 30,683 jobs could be created on existing tertiary lands. In the case of the analysis of industrial lands, all critical areas are included in the tertiary category.

In determining how population and employment are to be allocated to each jurisdiction, the policy direction is to begin by "building-out" all vacant and underutilized lands utilizing the GIS model and applying planning policy assumptions derived from the GMA process. Then to negotiate final allocation of projected growth remaining after "build-out".

Because the various cities have brought up the issue of how they would like to grow, the next step is to make adjustments to staff's projections based on input from the cities. This step should start right away.

After some questions and discussion by Committee members, Commissioner Morris indicated that information on what adjustments need to be made and why, need to be compiled by the end of June for the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

4. Septic systems in Urban Areas

Lou Dooley, Director of Environmental Health for the SW Washington Health District, presented issues on ground water protection. The Health District has felt strongly about protection of ground water as a resource and for drinking.

Historically, some residential developments within the current urban area have been constructed before public sewer infrastructure was available in the vicinity.

Consequently, many homes were constructed with on-site septic systems. Although it was probably believed that these homes would connect to public sewer later when it became available, many did not. Over the years landscaping, patios, decks, and accessory buildings were installed on lots with septic systems, and as these systems

began to fail from age or misuse, repair became difficult and room for expansion of drainfields became scarce.

Mr Dooley stated that limiting septic systems in urban areas makes sense. Septic systems are an appropriate way to treat and dispose of sewage in rural settings at rural densities. They are not appropriate at urban densities.

Mike Vinatieri, SW Washington Health District, displayed a large GIS map of the Vancouver Urban Growth Area showing parcels which contain septic systems and which are located within 200 feet of public sewer service lines. Public sewer is considered "available" to a parcel if it is located within 200 feet from the parcel. The map also showed the locations of public drinking water wellheads with their 1- 5- and 10-year zones of contribution. The Vancouver Sewer District service area boundary was shown on the map, as well as the boundaries of the Burnt Bridge Creek drainage basin.

Patty Grau, Hazel Dell Sewer District, displayed a map showing the Hazel Dell Sewer District service area Boundaries.

To protect our ground water, Lou Dooley urged the Committee to adopt and implement policies through the Comprehensive Plan that would :

- 1) reduce the number of existing septic systems within the urban growth area, and
- 2) prohibit new septic systems within the urban growth area.

Mr Dooley distributed a handout listing potential funding sources for such programs. Also, his draft memo to the Committee outlining his findings and recommendations was included among the items transmitted to the Committee Members.

Committee Members asked questions and discussed the issues. Mr Dooley indicated that for some of the parcels shown as having sewer available, there may be improvements needed to make service viable, such as installing larger lines. Rich Lowry indicated that the Health District does have the authority to enact stronger rules. Commissioner Morris opined that homeowners on septic systems may not have the necessary incentive to connect to public sewer due to the costs, and cautioned that the Committee proceed carefully. Jeanne Harris indicated that power companies and other utilities have come up with incentive programs. Morris said it will be easier if the jurisdictions proceed united. Lowry cautioned that for new houses where sewer service is not available, there are Constitutional limitations on preventing development. Brian Carlson pointed out that existing treatment plants do have the capacity to accommodate the lots on septic systems. Mr Dooley indicated that under current rules, the minimum site size for a septic permit is 18,000 square feet.

Following discussion, Commissioner Morris indicated a consensus among the Committee to direct the Health District to draft some plan of action, and discussed time frames. Mr Dooley indicated that he could meet a September time frame.

5. Technical Advisory Committee Update

- Further discussion of Environmental Review process

Pat Lee indicated that TAC members have discussed the environmental review process, and are trying to identify land use alternatives. He indicated that they would have a better handle on this after their meeting the following day (6/7/01).

- Discussion of future work program and timeline.

Mr Lee indicated that the TAC was pursuing three prongs of action:

- 1) working on population and employment allocation;
- 2) working on a review and evaluation report in accordance with RCW 36.70A.215 to determine whether projected densities and other growth assumptions are being achieved based on monitoring of actual growth; and
- 3) working on trying to revise the text of the Comp Plan to reflect new policy direction.

Rich Lowry cautioned that the separate 5-year review of the urban growth area under RCW 36.70A.215 and the 10-year review under RCW 36.70A.130(3) need to come together in order to reconcile any proposed changes to the UGA based on evaluation of past performance. The two separate discussions need to come together because we can't ignore past performance in looking at new boundary changes.

6. Next meeting time and date

The next Steering Committee meeting will be July 18th.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - june 6 2001(#18).doc